



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/665,888	09/20/2000	Chris Connaughton	2100226-991100	6813
30074	7590	12/23/2005	EXAMINER	
TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER LLP SUITE 1800 425 WALNUT STREET CINCINNATI, OH 45202-3957				SAIN, GAUTAM
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2176		

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/665,888	CONNAUGHTON, CHRIS	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Gautam Sain	2176		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### **Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2005.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 34-60 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 34-60 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/05.

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_ .  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_ .

### **DETAILED ACTION**

- 1) This is an Non-final action in response to filed 8/29/05 (via RCE).
- 2) Applicant cancelled claims 1-33 and added new claims 34-60.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

- 3) A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/29/05 has been entered.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

- 4) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 4-1) **Claims 34, 35, 36, 38, 43, 44, 45, 47, 52, 53, 54, 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Ape 3, 1999)(cited in previous actions), in view of Ogawa (US 5438661, issued 8/1/95).**

**Claim 34, 43, 52, Aiken teaches**

Parsing ... first document ... tags (ie., breaking document A into segments)(col 16, line 63-65);

Parsing ... second document ... tags(ie., breaking document B into segments)(col 16, 63-67);

Executing a routine ... groups (ie., matching contents from different documents in side by side windows)(col 17, lines 6-8; col 3, lines 60-63);

Rendering an image ... differences (ie., coloring of text to identify the actual content, actual content of document A)(col 3, lines 65-67; col 16, line 63).

Aiken does not expressly teach, but Ogawa suggests composing ... differences (ie., a new window to show comparison result from other windows)(col 2, lines 47-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken to include a new window to show comparison result from other windows as taught by Ogawa, providing the benefit of matching passages in another document in another frame in the user interface (Aiken, abstract section) and using the convenience of using of the multi-window environment, enabling simultaneous display on the different windows, displaying mutual distinctions (Ogawa, col 1, lines 39-50).

**Claims 35, 44, 53, Aiken teaches**

Routine identifies ... new groups (ie., nonmatching segments, like Segment 3)(fig 6, item 606).

**Claims 36, 45, 54, Aiken teaches**

Normalizing ... said matching (ie., only matching contents are added to the bar, so nonmatching contents are not added, thus ignored)(col 17, lines 42-45).

**Claims 38, 47, 56, Aiken teaches HTML (ie., HTML links)(col 3, line 50).**

**4-2) Claims 37, 46, 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (as cited above), in view of Ogawa (as cited above), further in view of Blumer et al (US 5890171, issued March 99)(previously cited).**

**Claims 37, 46, 55,** Aiken in view Ogawa does not expressly teach, but Blumer suggests removing character ... URLs (ie., a program that converts relative URL to an absolute URL)(col 8, lines 44-48; col 11, lines 40-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Ogawa to include converting relative URL to an absolute URL as taught by Blumer to provide the benefit of an improved system for interpreting hypertext links in a document when including the document within another document (Blumer, Title).

**4-3) Claims 39,40,41,42,48,49,50,51,57,58,59,60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (as cited above), in view of Ogawa (as cited above), further in view of Aoyama et al (US 5956726, filed Jun 1996)(previously cited).**

**Claims 39, 48, 57,** Aiken in view of Ogawa does not expressly teach, but Aoyama suggests normalizing ... end tag (ie., identify tags and ignoring tags and the character strings sandwiched between the ignored tags)(col 3, lines 50-60; col 7, lines 20-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Ogawa to include allocating the character strings between a start and an end tag as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the

difference between structured documents properly taking the logical meaning and structure of the structure documents (Aoyama, Abstract section).

**Claims 40, 49, 58,** Aiken in view of Ogawa does not expressly teach, but Aoyama suggests normalizing ... documents (ie., parsing method with rules that create a new node tree, which ignores tag nodes and extracts nodes with characters strings for comparison)(col 3, lines 62 – col 4, line 2; col 7, lines 20-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Ogawa to include parsing method with rules that create a node tree, which ignores tag nodes and extracts nodes with character strings for comparison as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference between structured documents properly taking the logical meaning and structure of the structured documents (Aoyama, Abstract section).

**Claims 41, 50, 59,** Aiken in view of Ogawa does not expressly teach, but Aoyama suggests normalizing ... documents (ie., parsing method with rules that create a new node tree, which ignores tag nodes and extracts nodes with characters strings for comparison)(col 3, lines 62 – col 4, line 2; col 7, lines 20-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Ogawa to include parsing method with rules that create a node tree, which ignores tag nodes and extracts nodes with character strings for comparison as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference between structured documents properly taking the logical meaning and structure of the structured documents (Aoyama, Abstract section).

**Claims 42, 51, 60,** Aiken in view of Ogawa does not expressly teach, but Aoyama suggests normalizing ... documents (ie., parsing method with rules that create a new node tree, which ignores tag nodes and extracts nodes with characters strings for comparison)(col 3, lines 62 – col 4, line 2; col 7, lines 20-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Ogawa to include parsing method with rules that create a node tree, which ignores tag nodes and extracts nodes with character strings for comparison as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference between structured documents properly taking the logical meaning and structure of the structured documents (Aoyama, Abstract section).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Examiner introduces a new line of rejection to address the newly added claims 34-60. The Examiner introduces the Ogawa reference.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

GS

  
HEATHER R. HERNDON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100